

Serial No. 09/702,963

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed December 15, 2004. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 1-38 are pending and rejected. By this response, the Applicant has amended claim 4 in response to Examiner's claim objection and has amended claim 11 to correct a minor typo, and claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-38 continue unamended.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicant submits that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated or obvious under the respective provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103. Further, the Applicant has addressed the Examiner's specification and claim objections.

It is to be understood that the Applicant, by amending the claims, does not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to the Applicant's subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, the Applicant is not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant responsive amendments.

Objections

Specification

The Examiner has objected to the abstract of the disclosure because of minor formalities. In response, the Applicant has amended the specification to remove the words "to inputs" on line 3 of the Abstract of the Disclosure.

Claims

The Examiner has objected to claim 4 because claim 4 recites the term "understands." In response, the Applicant has amended claim 4 to replace the term "understands" with the term "inputs". Support for the amendment of claim 4 is found at least in claim 12. Furthermore, Applicant has herein amended claim 11 to correct a minor typo. No new matter has been entered.

327993-1

Serial No. 09/702,963

Rejections

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-29, 31-35, and 37-38

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-29, 31-35, and 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Garner et al. (U.S. 5,745,501, hereinafter "Garner"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In general, Garner discloses a method and apparatus for generating integrated circuit test patterns for testing functionality of integrated circuits. In particular, Garner discloses validating integrated circuit test patterns, transforming the integrated circuit test patterns into test vectors, and applying the test vectors to external connections of an integrated circuit in order to test the functionality of the integrated circuit. (Garner, Abstract).

Garner, however, does not teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 1. Namely, Garner does not teach or suggest at least the limitation of "converting said stimulus values and the model of a computer component object behavior to test script."

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Garner discloses "[c]onverting stimulus values (202) and the model (208) into test script using translation block (214) to produce the integrated circuit test patterns at 218, which are applied to the translator (224), which produced test vectors..." (Office Action, page 3). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Garner discloses "...comparing the binary results obtained from the integrated circuit with the binary integrated circuit test patterns..." (Garner, Col. 7, Lines 58-59). In other words, as disclosed in Garner, integrated circuit test patterns simply comprise binary signals. A test script, on the other hand, comprises computer executable commands capable of being input to and processed by an automated test executor. As such, integrated circuit test patterns, as taught in Garner, are simply not test scripts, as taught in Applicant's independent claim 1.

Similarly, as taught in Garner, test vector signals are "...electrical signals having desired values, application times, and durations. Test vector signals include all power

327993-1

Serial No. 09/702,963

and ground signals, control signals, interrupt signals..." (Garner, Col. 7, Lines 37-39). As such, test vectors comprising electrical signals such as power signals and control signals, as taught in Garner, are simply not test scripts, as taught in Applicant's independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Garner and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §102 and is patentable thereunder. Furthermore, independent claims 11, 19, 27, and 35 recite apparatus and methods having features substantially similar to "converting said stimulus values and the model of a computer component object behavior to test script." Specifically, Garner does not teach or suggest the similar limitation of "converting the testing requirements and the system requirements into test script." Thus, Garner does not teach each and every element of independent claims 11, 19, 27, and 35. Therefore, claims 11, 19, 27, and 35 are not anticipated by Garner.

Thus, independent claims 1, 11, 19, 27 and 35 are patentable over Garner under 35 U.S.C. §102. Since each of claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-26, 28-29, 31-34, and 37-38 depend from one of independent claims 1, 11, 19, 27 and 35, these dependent claims are also allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 30 and 36

The Examiner has rejected claims 30 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Garner. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 30 and 36 depend from independent claims 27 and 35, respectively. As discussed above with respect to claims 27 and 35, Garner does not teach or suggest "converting the model of the computer component object behavior and the stimulus values into test script." As such, Garner fails to teach or suggest all of the elements claims 30 and 36.

Therefore, claims 30 and 36 are not obvious in view of Garner and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103.

327993-1

Serial No. 09/702,963

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all the rejections have been overcome and that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and its allowance are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/15/05

E J Wall
Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicant

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808